

REMARKS

Claims 7, 10, 14, 15, and 19 have been canceled. Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16-18, and amended claims 1 and 13 are in this application.

Claims 1-4, 11, 13, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,263,503 (Margulis) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,503 (Naka et al.) and U.S. Publication No. 2003/0202006 (Callway). Claims 5, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al. and Callway as applied to claim 4, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,836 (Huang et al.). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al. and Callway as applied to claim 4, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0187885 (Miyazaki et al.). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al., Callway and Huang et al. as applied to claim 7, and further in view of Miyazaki et al. Claims 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al. and Callway as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,557,338 (Maze et al.).

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein so as to include the features of dependent claim 10. Additionally, independent claim 13 has also been amended herein so as to include the features of dependent claim 10. (Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16 depend from one of amended independent claims 1 and 13.) Accordingly, only the above 103 rejection of claim 10 will be discussed below.

As a result of the above-described amendment of claim 1, claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"wherein the television receiving apparatus

includes at least two tuners and a controller for controlling station selecting states of the tuners, and the station selecting states of the tuners are controlled in response to a command generated in the secondary display."
(Emphasis added.)

In explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 10 and as best understood, the Examiner appears to assert that Maze (and in particular lines 16-55 of column 3 and elements 124, 126 and 180 of Fig. 1 of Maze) disclose the above features. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Maze do not appear to disclose "at least two tuners and a controller" of a television receiving apparatus which has a primary display and "controlling station selecting states of the tuners . . . , in response to a command generated in the secondary display" as in claim 1. (Emphasis added.) Although the portions of Maze relied on by the Examiner appear to mention a main tuner 124 and an inset tuner 126, such portions of Maze do not appear to disclose controlling station selecting states of such tuners 124 and 126 in response to a command generated in a secondary display.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway and Maze.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 13 is also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway and Maze.

Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16 are dependent from independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16 are

also distinguishable from the applied combinations of references.

Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis, Naka et al. and Callway as applied to claims 1 and 13, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,622 (Lan).

Claims 17 and 18 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 17 and 18 are also distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway and Maze for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Lan to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Maze. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17 and 18 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Margulis, Naka, Callway, Maze and Lan.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis in view of Huang et al. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margulis and Huang et al. as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Lan.

As previously indicated, claims 14, 15 and 19 have been canceled herein.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/524,175

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-396

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant(s)

974538_1.DOC